Case 2:05-cv-00518-GEB-EFB Document 107 Filed 10/06/08 Page 1 of 9

```
STEVEN H. GURNEE, ESO. SB# 66056
    JOHN A. MASON, ESQ. SB#166996
1
    GURNEE & DANIELS LLP
2
    2240 Douglas Boulevard, Suite 150
    Roseville, California 95661-3805
3
    Telephone (916) 797-3100
    Facsimile (916) 797-3131
4
    J. CLIFFORD GUNTER III (Texas Bar No. 08627000)
5
    ANDREW EDISON (Texas Bar No. 00790629)
    BRACEWELL & GIÙLIANI LLP
    Pennzoil Place - South Tower
6
    711 Louisiana Street, Suite 2300
7
    Houston, TX 77002-2781
8
    Attorneys for Defendant
    POWEŘEX CORP., a Canadian Corporation
9
10
11
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
12
                           EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
13
    CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
                                               Case No. 2:05-CV-00518-GEB-EFB
14
    WATER RESOURCES
15
                   Plaintiff.
                                               POWEREX CORP.'S ANSWER TO
                                               SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT
           VS.
16
17
    POWEREX CORP., a Canadian Corporation,
    dba POWEREX ENERGY CORP., and DOES )
18
    1 - 100.
19
                   Defendants.
20
21
                                               Complaint filed: February 10, 2005
22
23
           Defendant Powerex Corp. ("Powerex") answers the Second Amended Complaint of
24
    California Department of Water Resources ("DWR") as follows:
25
26
27
28
```

Responses to Allegations

- 1. Admit that Plaintiff has correctly quoted from the Ninth Circuit's *Lockyer* decision, but deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 1 of the Second Amended Complaint.
 - 2. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 2 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 3. Admit that DWR seeks a declaration that all the contracts or transactions with Powerex from January 17, 2001 through December 31, 2001 are void and of no force and effect, but deny that there is any legal or factual basis for DWR's claim.
- 4. Admit the allegations contained in paragraph 4 of the Second Amended Complaint, but note that California Energy Resources Scheduling Division is a division of DWR and has no separate legal standing.
- 5. Admit the allegations contained in paragraph 5 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 6. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 6 of the Second Amended Complaint. Powerex further notes that this Court's August 21, 2008 order specifically dismissed the Doe Defendants.
 - 7. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 7 of the Second Amended Complaint.
 - 8. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 8 of the Second Amended Complaint.
 - 9. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 9 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 10. Admit the allegations contained in paragraph 10 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 11. Admit the allegations contained in paragraph 11 of the Second Amended Complaint, but note that while Powerex is headquartered in Canada, it is organized under the laws of British Columbia.

Case 2:05-cv-00518-GEB-EFB Document 107 Filed 10/06/08 Page 3 of 9

- 12. Admit the allegations contained in paragraph 12 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 13. Admit the allegations contained in paragraph 13 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 14. Admit the allegations contained in paragraph 14 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 15. Admit the first two sentences of paragraph 15 of the Second Amended Complaint. Powerex is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the third sentence of paragraph 15 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 16. Admit the allegations contained in paragraph 16 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 17. Admit the allegations contained in the first four sentences of paragraph 17 of the Second Amended Complaint. Powerex is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the fifth sentence of paragraph 17 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 18. Admit the allegations contained in paragraph 18 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 19. Admit the allegations contained in the first and fourth sentences of paragraph 19 of the Second Amended Complaint. Deny the allegations contained in the second and third sentences of paragraph 19 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 20. Powerex is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 20 of the Second Amended Complaint.

Case 2:05-cv-00518-GEB-EFB Document 107 Filed 10/06/08 Page 4 of 9

- 21. Admit the allegations contained in paragraph 21 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 22. Admit the allegations contained in paragraph 22 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 23. Powerex is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the first sentence of paragraph 23 of the Second Amended Complaint. Admit the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 23 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 24. Powerex is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 24 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 25. Powerex is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the first sentence of paragraph 25 of the Second Amended Complaint. Deny the allegations contained in the second sentence of paragraph 25 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 26. Admit the allegations contained in the third sentence of paragraph 26 of the Second Amended Complaint. Deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 26 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 27. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 27 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 28. Powerex is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the first and second sentences of paragraph 28 of the Second Amended Complaint. Deny the allegations contained in the third and fourth sentences of paragraph 28 of the Second Amended Complaint.

- 30. Powerex is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the first and third sentences of paragraph 30 of the Second Amended Complaint. Deny the allegations contained in the second and fourth sentences of paragraph 30 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 31. Admit the allegations contained in the first sentence of paragraph 31 of the Second Amended Complaint. Powerex is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 31 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 32. Admit the allegations contained in the first sentence of paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Complaint. Deny the allegations contained in the second sentence of paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 33. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 33 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 34. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 34 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 35. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 35 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 36. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 36 of the Second Amended Complaint.

.

 37. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 37 of the Second Amended Complaint, except as qualified by the responses to paragraphs 1-36 above.

- 38. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 38 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 39. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 39 of the Second Amended Complaint, except as qualified by the responses to paragraphs 1-38 above.
- 40. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 40 of the Second Amended Complaint.
- 41. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 41 of the Second Amended Complaint, except as qualified by the responses to paragraphs 1-40 above.
- 42. Admit that DWR has correctly quoted from California Civil Code Section 1689(b)(6).
- 43. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 43 of the Second Amended Complaint.

<u>AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES</u>

- 1. **First Defense (Failure to State a Cause of Action):** As a first, separate and distinct affirmative defense to the Second Amended Complaint, Powerex alleges that plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, and each cause of action therein, fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action.
- 2. Second Defense (Exclusive Jurisdiction): As a second, separate and distinct affirmative defense to the Second Amended Complaint, Powerex alleges that plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint herein, and each cause of action therein, is barred by the doctrine of exclusive jurisdiction because the determination of material issues lies exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

3. **Third Defense (Filed Rate Doctrine):** As a third, separate and distinct affirmative defense to the Second Amended Complaint, Powerex alleges that plaintiff's claims are barred by the filed rate doctrine.

- 4. **Fourth Defense (Preemption):** As a fourth, separate and distinct affirmative defense to the Second Amended Complaint, Powerex alleges that plaintiff's claims are barred by federal preemption (both conflict and field preemption).
- 5. **Fifth Defense (Failure to Mitigate):** As a fifth, separate and distinct affirmative defense to the Second Amended Complaint, Powerex alleges that plaintiff has failed to mitigate its damages.
- 6. **Sixth Defense (Consent):** As a sixth, separate and distinct affirmative defense to the Second Amended Complaint, Powerex alleges that plaintiff knowingly and willingly expressly or impliedly consented to the matters described in the second amended complaint.
- 7. **Seventh Defense (Equitable Defenses):** As a seventh, separate and distinct affirmative defense to the Second Amended Complaint, Powerex alleges that principles of equity and equitable considerations bar all relief requested by plaintiff against this answering defendant.
- 8. **Eighth Defense (Unclean Hands):** As an eighth, separate and distinct affirmative defense to the Second Amended Complaint, Powerex alleges that plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, and each cause of action therein, is barred by the doctrine of unclean hands.

////

////

////

- 9. **Ninth Defense (Failure to Pursue/Exhaust Other Remedies):** As a ninth, separate and distinct affirmative defense to the Second Amended Complaint, Powerex alleges that plaintiff has failed to proceed first against the answering defendant before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
- 10. **Tenth Defense (Laches):** As a tenth, separate and distinct affirmative defense to the Second Amended Complaint, Powerex alleges that plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, and each cause of action therein, is barred by the doctrine of laches.
- 11. Eleventh Defense (Fault of Others): As an eleventh, separate and distinct affirmative defense to the Second Amended Complaint, Powerex alleges that said harm, loss, or wrong, was either wholly or in part caused by persons, firms, corporations or entities other than this answering defendant, and said fault is either imputed to said plaintiff by reason of the relationship of said parties to plaintiff and/or comparatively reduces the percentage of responsibility, of this answering defendant.
- 12. **Twelfth Defense (Estoppel):** As a twelfth, separate and distinct affirmative defense to the Second Amended Complaint, Powerex alleges that plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, and each cause of action therein, is barred by the doctrine of estoppel.
- 13. **Thirteenth Defense (Unjust Enrichment):** As a thirteenth, separate and distinct affirmative defense to the Second Amended Complaint, Powerex alleges that plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, and each cause of action therein, is barred because relief could constitute unjust enrichment.
- 14. **Fourteenth Defense (Standing):** As a fourteenth, separate and distinct affirmative defense to the Second Amended Complaint, Powerex alleges that plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, and each cause of action therein, is barred because plaintiff

Case 2:05-cv-00518-GEB-EFB Document 107 Filed 10/06/08 Page 9 of 9 lacks standing to pursue claims on behalf of the California Energy Resources Scheduling 1 (CERS). 2 15. Fifteenth Defense (Reservation of Additional Affirmative Defenses): As a 3 4 fifteenth, separate and distinct affirmative defense to the Second Amended Complaint, 5 Powerex alleges that because plaintiff's claims are framed in broad and conclusory language, 6 defendant reserves the right to assert other affirmative defenses as may be warranted as 7 discovery in this action proceeds. 8 9 **CONCLUSION** Powerex asks that plaintiff take nothing by its Second Amended Complaint, that 10 11 judgment be rendered in favor of Powerex and against plaintiff, with Powerex awarded costs 12 of suit, attorneys' fees, and such other and further relief as the court may deem appropriate. 13 DATED: October 6, 2008 **GURNEE & DANIELS LLP** 14 15 16 s/JOHN A. MASON STEVEN H. GURNEE 17 JOHN A. MASON GURNEE, & DANIELS 18 19 J. CLIFFORD GUNTER III ANDREW EDISON 20 BRACEWELL & GIULIANI LLP 21 Attorneys for Defendant 22 POWEREX CORP 23 24 25

26

27

28